REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1, 3, and 4 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a mobile unit transmits an identification portion in its response signal. Further, claim 4 has been amended to clarify that of the signals transmitted, a signal transmitted at first by a first antenna is used at least for the waking up control signal and the other signals are only used for measuring reception intensities. Support for the amendments, may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0092] and [0097] of the published specification. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned amendments. Claim 1 is independent. The remaining claims depend directly from claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0025823 ("Hara"). Claims 1 and 4 have been amended by way of this reply. To the extent that the rejections still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

One or more embodiments of the claimed invention are directed to a vehicular remote control system comprising a mobile unit and a vehicle unit. In an exemplary embodiment, the mobile unit transmits one signal encompassing reception intensity information of the sequentially received signals all at once and an ID portion for storing the ID data of the mobile

unit to the vehicle unit, enabling the vehicle unit to locate the mobile unit based on the reception intensity information. Thus, transmitting reception intensity information in the aforementioned format includes all the necessary information for determining the location of the mobile unit while also reducing the total amount of lag time. Specifically, the method described above shortens the period of transmitting the response signal and the period of decoding the signal at the vehicle unit by collecting all the reception intensity information first before transmitting the signal (*i.e.* in contrast to receiving and then transmitting reception intensity information corresponding to each antenna separately). (*See, e.g.*, Published Specification, paragraph [0088]).

Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein said mobile unit sequentially receives signals transmitted from at least one of the transmission antennas to measure the reception intensities of the sequentially received signals, and then transmits *a response signal including an ID portion for storing the intrinsic identification information of the mobile unit* and reception intensity *information of the* sequentially received *signals all at once* to said vehicle unit." The aforementioned limitation explicitly requires that the mobile unit transmits a response signal that includes (i) an ID portion; and (ii) reception intensity information that was acquired from sequentially received signals.

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (*see* MPEP § 2143.03). The Applicant respectfully asserts that Hara fails to show or suggest at least the aforementioned limitations required by claim 1.

Specifically, the Examiner admits that "Hara does not specifically state sending the second signals all at once, as required by the claim, and, Hara also does not specifically disclose sending the signals sequentially," (*see* Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007, page 5).

However, the Examiner cites paragraph [0072] of Hara to illustrate that Hara teaches signals [sent] from the antennas of the stationary device can be emitted sequentially or concurrently to the portable device. Based on the aforementioned citation, the Examiner asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that as long as Hara performs its desired functionality of having the stationary device determining the current position of the portable device using reception intensity data, the signals from the portable device can also be emitted sequentially or concurrently. The Applicant respectfully submits that this is incorrect.

Specifically, the claimed invention requires that the mobile unit transmit reception intensity information all at once (*i.e.*, not transmitting multiple signals concurrently). In fact, transmitting multiple signals concurrently would likely result in non-desired functions. In particular, radio signals transmitted concurrently would interfere with each other causing the receiver in the vehicle to decode the signals inaccurately (*e.g.*, which could possibly result in unlocking the wrong door), unless the signals are set at different frequencies. Hara neither shows, nor suggests, transmitting signals all at once at alternate frequencies. Thus, it is not obvious that the format of the response signal, which is suitable for being emitted by the mobile unit, are transmitted all at once.

In view of the above, amended independent claim 1 and dependent claim 4 are patentable over Hara for at least the above reasons. Dependent claims 3-4 are also patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-4 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 15115/106001).

Dated: June 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By_____

Thomas K. Scherer
Registration No.: 45,079
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant